

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JUNE 13, 1878.

The Week.

THE Republicans have recovered slightly from the first shock of Anderson's testimony given a week ago, and if it had not been for the Oregon election their position might be said to have improved. It now begins to be seen pretty clearly that everything is going to turn on the election of the new House this fall. In the present House the Democrats have a majority of only a dozen or so, and though the Senate after March 4, 1879, is certain to be Democratic for the first time since the South seceded, this is the effect of old victories, while in the most recent popular elections (those in which the members of the present House were elected) the Democrats lost heavily. This looked like a turn in the tide, and if it continued to flow it would give the Republicans the lower House this fall. But now the question is, Is it flowing or ebbing? There is certainly no reason to look to the South, for there the few seats the Republicans hold (some half a dozen) must be lost this autumn. The loss of these seats makes the Democratic majority to be overcome between twenty and thirty, and the means of overcoming it must be provided by Northern or Western States. On this account the shrewder politicians have been looking to the result of the Oregon election with mingled dread and hope. If it had gone Republican, the result would have been regarded as the first ripple of a "tidal wave" which might be expected to sweep over the North and West in the fall. But it has gone Democratic, or, to adopt the metaphorical language appropriate to subjects of this kind, the "first gun" of the campaign has not only missed fire, but has exploded at the same time, scattering destruction among the ranks of the hard-pressed Republican garrison. The loss of Oregon in 1880 is, of course, a severe blow. From Missouri and Ohio, both of which States have been redistricted, the Democrats expect, apparently with reason, to get increased strength, so that the question of the Republican control of the House narrows itself down to the problem of securing at least twenty-five seats next fall. It is evident at a glance that this will be difficult to accomplish, and an appreciation of the difficulty is at the bottom of much of the present Democratic confidence as to the future. According to the Democratic view, these twenty-five seats are not likely to be obtained in any case; how are they to be secured with an investigating committee at work publishing campaign documents like the Anderson confession from month to month?

The Committee has during the week heard the story of Judge Levisce, one of the Louisiana Republican electors, about the way in which an attempt was made to bribe him either not to cast his vote or to vote for Tilden. He appears to be a humorous and respectable old gentleman, who fully recognized the wickedness of Louisiana politicians and the difficulty the Committee would have in believing that a Louisiana elector had refused a large bribe. He told how he had been called on at his boarding-house by an excited man named Johnson, who let the ladies of the house know before he saw him that he was likely to get \$100,000 as a bribe; how he was taken to a lonely part of the city; how he was then offered from \$30,000 to \$40,000 not to accept his appointment as elector; how he said it was not enough, and in order to find out what Johnson was after and who was backing him, and at the same time to protect his own virtue, he put his price at \$200,000; how, after other interviews with Johnson's confederates, on its appearing that only \$100,000 could be raised, the matter was dropped. In this condition it looks badly for the Democrats, who say, however, that the offer was made in the interest of gamblers who had laid heavy odds on Tilden and were afraid they were going to be ruined. One other thing Mr.

Levisce also testified, namely, that he did not sign his name to one of the certificates sent on to the President of the Senate by the Louisiana Republicans. The first certificate was informal, and was sent back to be corrected, but time was pressing and Mr. Levisce and other electors could not be found, so "the boys" forged his name eight times themselves. This did not really affect the validity of the count; but it is useful as illustrating the reckless and unscrupulous state of mind of the Louisiana politicians.

The response made by the President to the request of the House Committee of Investigation for the correspondence relating to Anderson's appointment shows that the latter was strongly recommended for a foreign consulship by the Republican delegation from Louisiana, backed up by Mr. W. P. Kellogg; that when a vacancy occurred in the important post of Callao, Peru, Mr. Stanley Matthews "specially requested" that he (Anderson) might have it "for important reasons"; that this application of Mr. Matthews was "respectfully referred" to the Secretary of State by the President, and was fortified by another letter from Mr. Matthews, in which he said that "the circumstances in which he (Anderson) had been placed gave him very strong claims on the Administration in the public interests," and Mr. Matthews "most earnestly urged" that "some satisfactory employment might be found for him in the public service at once." At this stage in the process Anderson was appointed Consul at Funchal, and then charges against him of general rascality began to reach the White House. The President then directed that his commission should be withheld until further enquiries were made about his character. The result was he got nothing, and was compelled in justice to himself to "squeal" on his distinguished "pal," Mr. Stanley Matthews. The President has thus, considering some things, come out of the affair very well, but considering other things not so well. It was hardly, for instance, becoming in a civil-service reformer, nominated on the Cincinnati platform, to appoint to a consulship a man of outrageously bad character on the urgent solicitation of Congressmen. The enquiry about Anderson which led to the rescinding of his appointment ought to have preceded the appointment.

Mr. Sherman seems to be laboring under a curious error about the part which he now plays in the House investigation. He has sent in a formal offer to prove that there was great and operative intimidation in certain parishes in Louisiana, and has submitted the names of fifty witnesses whom he proposes to have summoned in support of his charges. But it is no part of the duties of the Secretary of the Treasury to prove before a House Committee intimidation at an election in a distant State of which he is not a resident, and at an election at which he was not present. This can be done far more effectively, we are sure, by Louisiana politicians. What the public and the Committee want to know of Mr. Sherman now is, whether he really wrote or did not write that Anderson letter of which a copy was shown him, and what he was doing down in Louisiana during the count, and particularly whether he encouraged anybody to "stand firm" in unlawful conduct. It is to these things he should direct his attention, and on these he should be frank, bluff, and categorical, and liberal with his witnesses.

The House Committee invited Mr. Stanley Matthews to appear before them to explain his correspondence with Anderson, and the public supposed that he would not need to be invited. He appears, however, to have made up his mind at a very early period that this was the last thing he would do, looking on the Committee doubtless, like Mr. Blaine, as a lot of "Confederate brigadiers." So he moved for the appointment of a Committee of the Senate to investigate him, and then wrote to the House Committee that they could not see him. Whereupon, on the motion of the indignant Butler, they

ordered him to be subpoenaed, but it is more than doubtful whether they can subpoena a Senator while Congress is in session, and we shall probably have a conflict of jurisdiction. Mr. Ferry displayed no such caution, but appeared and told all he knew about counting the vote with the greatest alacrity. Mr. Matthews has made an explanation of his position to the newspaper correspondents; which is, that he tried to get Anderson an office to avoid scandal, but without any knowledge of his guilty practices. The advantage he hopes to gain by giving his testimony before the Senate Committee is, doubtless, that he will not be severely cross-examined. We would advise him now to dismiss the whole subject from his mind, and plunge into finance once more. There are several curious bills he might still introduce.

The report of the proceedings of the Florida sub-committee is nearly as voluminous as that of the main investigating body sitting at Washington. They have been examining three worthies who made the canvass of Baker County that gave the State to Hayes by forty majority, and prevented it from going for Tilden by ninety-five majority. County Judge Driggers, one of the local board of canvassers, found to his surprise that the clerk and one Dorman, a justice of the peace, had, without waiting for his assistance, canvassed the votes and reported a Democratic majority. Feeling sore at this treatment, he concluded he had a right to get up a board of his own without either, so he made one Bill Green a justice of the peace *ad hoc*, and called in Sheriff Allen, and together they secretly got access to the ballots, made a recanvass, and "figured what would be the result" if certain precincts were thrown out. The result was that two were thrown out—one, on the ground of "intimidation" (the fact being that some man told Driggers his vote had been refused, and promised an affidavit to that effect), and the other because of illegal voting (the fact being that half a dozen names on the list were those of non-residents, but they were not necessary to the Democratic majority). Testimony was also given as to ballot-stuffing in Leon County, at Precinct No. 13, by Inspector Bowes, "who now holds a position in Washington." He put in 73 or 74 "jolly jokers," and made his count to correspond, and boasted that he had saved the State to Hayes. Finally, McLin testified that there were several returns from Baker County, but that he presented to the State Canvassing Board only the Driggers return, "because it appeared to be properly attested, and was most favorable to the Republican party." The others he did not think it necessary to read to the Board.

The active branch of Congress during the week has been the Senate. The Army Bill was passed on Saturday, much improved; for the total strength was fixed at 25,000, the transfer of the Indian Bureau was stricken out, and the section prohibiting the use of the Army as a posse comitatus was so modified as to make its insertion of very little consequence. The Senate also passed the River and Harbor Appropriation Bill, much inflated, and the bill to execute the Fisheries Award, gave Captain Eads the modification of his contract which he prayed for, postponed the Texas-and-Pacific Subsidy Bill till the next session, and granted Mr. Stanley Matthews a committee to investigate his acts as a "visiting statesman." The committee consists of Messrs. Edmunds, Allison, Ingalls, Davis of Illinois, Whyte, and Jones of Florida. The House has passed the General Deficiency Bill; but its principal achievement has been the disposing of the Tariff Bill by a vote of 134 to 120, which took place on Wednesday, the 5th inst., when the enacting clause was stricken out. The nays were all Democrats, with six exceptions. Mr. Wood's defeat was brought about by the votes of high-tariff Democrats from Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Iowa, Maryland, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

Mention should be made of the speech of Mr. Herbert, of Alabama, who surprised the House on Thursday by an assault on the Texas-

and-Pacific subsidy scheme which for vigor and thoroughness has seldom been surpassed. It is to be hoped that some Southern member will perform the like office for the Brazilian mail subsidy when that impudent piece of log-rolling comes to a vote in the House. In the Senate Mr. Christianity characterized it without contradiction as a bill to appropriate public money for the benefit of John Roach, and not to secure a mail service with Brazil, that having been already secured at the moderate cost of \$1,200 per year. Senator Wadleigh showed that it was in direct conflict with the platforms of both political parties of his State. Senator Whyte, of Maryland, made an almost piteous appeal to his brother Senators not to transfer to other ports by an act of legislation a line of trade which the city of Baltimore has built up by the diligence and sagacity of her merchants, extending over a period of fifty years. Senator Kernan dealt some heavy blows at the measure, but it passed by a vote of 26 to 18, the affirmative vote consisting chiefly of New England protectionists and Senators from the Gulf States, who had been hooked by the proviso for a subsidized line from New Orleans and Galveston. The Virginia Senators were brought in by an amendment requiring the New York steamers to put in at Norfolk, 500 miles out of their way. The only valuable amendment fastened upon the bill was one offered by Mr. Eaton, of Connecticut, limiting the duration of the subsidy to five years.

The House Judiciary Committee has had the good sense or the political shrewdness to report against the Maryland Memorial and the Kimmel Bill impugning the President's title. It declares that the Forty-fourth Congress was the only body authorized to count the vote for the President for the term now pending; that no other Congress has any power to revise its decision or set it aside, or to confer authority on the Supreme Court to do so. This of course is the law, and if it were not, would have to be made the law if the Government were to last. It is little short of lunacy to suppose that the Government could last if the majority in each Congress had the power to declare who was President and who was not, or, in other words, to keep the count open for four years and to turn the President out of office on the discovery of anything in an election held in forty different States, which could be called "fraud." This would be the introduction of the English parliamentary power over the Executive, with changes and modifications adapting it to a community of cracked philosophers or turbulent Central Americans. How little danger there has ever been of the toleration of any such political gimcracks here has been shown by the promptness with which the Democrats have had to repudiate all thought of it. Even Tammany Hall has had to resolve that it would have nothing to do with any such folly.

The boarding of a crowded street-car at ten in the evening by five robbers, who soundly thrashed and robbed one of the passengers, and made their escape with his money, has been one of the curious incidents of the week. They owed their success in part to the fact that, as the passengers were mostly returning from a picnic, they thought the affair was a private row, until it was all over, and the oddity of it is heightened by the fact that two militiamen in uniform, though unarmed, were in the car. In order to heighten the effect of it, the reporters at first represented these two as eleven, fully armed and accoutred, and made them run like hares when they saw the thieves. The affair is called unprecedented, but it is not so. About seven years ago the assistant librarian of the Astor Library was seized and his pockets rifled, on the platform of a Third Avenue car, at two o'clock in the afternoon, and when he made an outcry had his head punched and was thrown into the street, and we believe never got any redress. More recently a man had his watch taken on the same line, and pursued the thief round and round the car, the confederates of the latter holding him back by his coat-tails, and the passengers looking quietly on, thinking that some bad characters were having a lark. In fact, a promis-

cnous body of persons is peculiarly exposed to surprises of this kind, and the wonder is that the thieves do not avail themselves more freely of the fact.

The week has not been notable for any very important financial or commercial event. Both here and in London the rates for loans have fallen to figures that mark extreme dulness; three months' discounts in London are as low as $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and short loans have been reported as low as $\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{3}{4}$ of 1 per cent. (per annum). This condition of the money market makes a great demand for interest-bearing securities that are believed to be safe. The sales of U. S. 4 per cents here were large, and the Treasury notified the holders of \$5,000,000 more 6 per cent. bonds that they will be paid off; which makes \$20,000,000 of 6 per cents notified for redemption since the Syndicate contract of April 11 was signed. The large subscriptions to the 4 per cents creates a demand for gold sufficient to keep the price at about 101. Silver has been steady during the week, and at the close the bullion value of the new silver dollar was \$0.9029 gold.

The Congress is at last to meet in Berlin, as originally proposed, with Prince Bismarck as president; but no more is known than before about the nature of the preliminary arrangement between England and Russia. Lord Beaconsfield and the Marquis of Salisbury appear for England, and it is reported that Prince Bismarck has drawn up a memorandum of the points to be discussed, which contains also something in the nature of an outline plan of his own. The arrangement between England and Russia, whatever it may be, has apparently not had the effect of conciliating Austria, which is reported as more distrustful and suspicious than heretofore. But this is in part, at least, based on her continued military activity, which may be due to the expectation that she will be called on by the Congress for something in the nature of an occupation of some portion of the Turkish provinces. Troubles, too, are brewing in other quarters, which show that the Congress will not meet a day too soon. The hostility between the Russians and Rumanians grows steadily, and the former has at last taken the extreme course of forcing the Rumanian army out of positions on its own soil and substituting her own troops. The Bucharest Government has, too, made it known, though, we believe, not officially, that whatever may be the decision of the Congress about Bessarabia, it will not be surrendered by Rumania except to force. In fact, all things considered, no Congress since that of Vienna in 1815 has had such a job before it as the present one, with the difference, too, that the Vienna Congress was dealing with nations that were utterly tired of fighting, while this one has to pacify some which are longing for the fray, or, at all events, would be nothing loath to try their hand in one.

The German Emperor, whether luckily or unluckily for the Socialists it is hard to say, is recovering from his wounds, a wonderful proof of the vigor of his constitution. The would-be assassin, Nobiling, has been examined, but his condition is such that little or nothing has been extracted from him beyond a story that the task of killing the Emperor had been imposed upon him by lot, and that he was the agent of some kind of association. The investigation set on foot in consequence of this, however, has revealed nothing to confirm it, and the opinion gains ground that he was an isolated lunatic, with Socialist views and relations. The incident is none the less being used by Prince Bismarck to strengthen him in his efforts after repressive legislation. The bill which has just been defeated gave the Government almost discretionary power for three years over publications or meetings or societies having "Socialistic tendencies," and making the police the sole judge of the fact. Of course, this would have placed every newspaper in the country at their mercy. He now proposes to dissolve the Reichstag and trust to the prevailing horror caused by the attempt on the Emperor's

life to give him a good majority, which will enable him not only to carry the Socialist Bill but the other changes in the Federal machinery in which he has recently been defeated. The preparations talked of to resist Socialism thus far seem to be wholly material except the offer of aid from the Pope, which comes curiously enough, it is said, as a *quid pro quo*—that is, he will operate against Socialism with the armory of the Church if Germany will modify the Falk laws; as if the Church was not always bound to work against evil.

An interesting decision has just been made by the English Master of the Rolls on the application of an English clergyman, Mr. Besant, the husband of the now well-known "advanced thinker" who, with Mr. Bradlaugh, was convicted some months ago of having published and circulated an indecent and otherwise immoral book. Mrs. Besant separated from her husband some years ago, owing to religious differences, retaining by common consent the custody of their only child, a daughter, during eleven months of the year. Since then she has "progressed" so rapidly that she has not only discarded all religious belief, but holds such extreme opinions upon marriage and other social arrangements as to exclude her from the society of nearly all the well-behaved and respectable portion of her own sex, and is educating her daughter in her own views; but there is no doubt of her sincerity and conscientiousness. Under these circumstances the father has asked the Court of Chancery to pronounce her unfit to have charge of her child, and the Court has given judgment in his favor on the general ground that a parent has no right to bring up a child in such a way as to inflict on it permanent social disability or disgrace. It has, however, been pointed out that, apart from Mrs. Besant's share in the publication of the indecent book, her general system of training is almost precisely that adopted by Mr. James Mill in the education of his son John Stuart, and the question consequently arises, Would the courts, if applied to by one parent, take away a child from the custody of another for bringing it up oddly, or in a manner to make it peculiar and out of harmony with the society in which it was to live? Whether it will be well for the courts to have such discretion may be doubted, but there can be little doubt that there is no more odious form of oppression than that sometimes inflicted by a queer, eccentric parent in bringing up a sensitive and shy child to hold the same relations to the world as he himself holds.

Probably nothing produces more bad blood among "esteemed contemporaries" than disputes about their comparative circulation. Every now and then one of them publishes a self-laudatory article in which it shows by some process, which the others pronounce utterly delusive, that its edition is vastly greater than that of any of the others—sometimes than that of all the others put together; there then follows much recrimination, and a solemn challenge on one side or the other to leave the whole matter in controversy to some very partial authority, which is of course not accepted, and the disputants separate with mutual maledictions. Here this usually excites the merriment of the public; in France it is a serious matter. Under the French law, to give a disparaging account of an "esteemed contemporary's" circulation, either by putting it lower than it really is, or by representing it untruly as lower than your own, is to commit an offence known as "*concurrency déloyal*," and makes you liable to pursuit before the Tribunal of Commerce. Accordingly, the *Figaro* having copied from the New York *Herald* the other day an account of the circulation of the *Univers*, which the latter pronounced incorrect, it was cited before the Tribunal, which found it guilty, not of "unfair competition," but of having unjustifiably excited a prejudice, and accordingly fined it \$100. What materials such a judgment would furnish here for comments on the force of human envy and baseness, and the vastness and beneficence of the work done by at least one journal for the country and for humanity!

THE ELECTORAL SYSTEM AND THE PRESIDENTIAL
COUNT.

TWO subjects connected with Presidential elections have occupied the attention of the present Congress during the past eight months—the electoral system itself and the electoral count. Both became in 1876 the objects of much interest, and the extraordinary difficulties which Congress met in 1877 in deciding the results of the Presidential election of the year before fully justified the popular anxiety. Since the present Congress met, discussion has chiefly concentrated itself on the supposed defects of the electoral system, and little has been heard of the count. With regard to the former, the objection raised is that through the instrumentality of the Electoral College the results of the popular and of the secondary elections do not necessarily correspond; that a candidate may be elected by a minority of the popular vote. To this it is replied that the object of the framers of the Government was not to secure a popular machinery, but to have the President represent a majority of the States; that this object obviously cannot be attained except by making the State in some way the electoral unit, and that any change in the direction of a purely popular vote would be merely a blow at the independence of the States. To this it may be replied with considerable force that whatever the object of the framers of the Constitution originally was, the actual result of the system they introduced has been a thoroughly popular election, in which everybody practically casts a direct vote for President and Vice-President, supplemented, however, by an antiquated and obsolete device known as an electoral college, but really a mere clerical registration board, which, instead of registering the result of the popular election, records a totally different result, by which the former may be actually upset. In other words, we have popularized the method of reaching the result, but this popularization has no effect on the result itself. Long reflection on this hardship, produced by the inflexibility of the constitutional provisions on the subject, brought the late Senator Morton, in one of his more thoughtful moods, to the conclusion that the framers of the Government hated the people and popular government, and that their absurd device of an electoral college was a sort of last asylum in our system of the "aristocratic" principle.

Several means have been suggested for rooting out this anti-popular feature: election by districts; election by States, with the added safeguard of a minority representation after the vote; the abolition of the electoral college—all of them being based on the idea of securing as nearly as possible a direct popular system. Of course there is no certain way of obtaining this short of a total abolition of State lines, and a direct vote by the whole people; even the introduction of the electoral system by districts would not absolutely secure it; for, although the districts are geographical divisions based solely on population, they are merely smaller units than States, and it is possible to conceive without much difficulty of a political situation in which enormous party majorities in a minority of districts might be pitted against slight majorities in a majority of districts, in which case a President might be elected by a popular minority as now. Indeed, so long as the "solid South" continues to be opposed in Presidential elections to a "solid North," this result is not unlikely, whether the electoral units be States or districts. Besides this, there is another serious objection to the district system, which the history of the various State governments ought to suggest—the danger of gerrymandering. As long as State lines are preserved this danger is reduced to a minimum. The established States with fixed boundaries cannot be tampered with, nor can a new State be carved out of an old one without the consent of both; here and there a territory may be erected into a State for party purposes; but this occurs so seldom that it may be called a small danger. But, the district system introduced, gerrymandering begins at once. The dominant party will necessarily in its own interest begin to "fix" the division lines so as to give itself as many districts as possible, and we should probably soon be confronted with an "apportionment" scandal on a national scale, simi-

lar in kind, but incomparably greater in degree and more disastrous in its results, than that which we have witnessed during the past few years in this State. Among Congressional districts the ravages of the gerrymander may always be seen going on. Within the past fortnight the Republican newspapers have been raising a cry, probably well justified by the facts, over the "redistricting" by the Democrats of Ohio and Missouri; and we may be certain that redistricting will become an even more active form of political activity the moment it is found that Presidential elections may be made to hinge on it.

But, whatever may be thought of these reasons, there is the insuperable difficulty in the way of a radical change that it must be introduced through a constitutional amendment, which there is no reasonable probability of getting adopted by the requisite number of States. The present system throws enormous power into the hands of the large States, and no change could recommend itself generally which threatened to curtail this. In 1876, for instance, the possibility of having all the electoral votes of New York counted in favor of the Democratic candidate was the pivot on which the election turned. There is every reason why the politicians of such States as New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, or Illinois should bitterly oppose any scheme which has for its express object the reduction of their political influence and the equalization of it with that of other smaller, poorer, and less powerful communities.

We may, therefore, on the whole, dismiss from our calculations as to the last degree improbable all the proposed alterations of our electoral system. That will probably continue to go on as heretofore. There remains, however, the other branch of electoral reform—that relating to the count of the electoral vote by Congress. With regard to this there has been no difference of opinion for some years. The provisions of the Constitution were proved two years ago, as they had been long known to be, entirely inadequate. In fact, beyond the existence of a provision that the votes are to be "opened" and "counted," there may be said to be no provisions whatever. Accordingly, we were confronted in 1876 with all sorts of startling and revolutionary theories on the subject—among others that the President of the Senate was vested by the Constitution with all the powers of a returning board, and could determine, without possibility of interference, the result of a disputed Presidential election. Even with the machinery of an electoral bill devised for the express purpose, the questions raised after the election of 1876 were so numerous and intricate that the count was protracted until the very eve of a new term and the country threatened with all the dangers of an interregnum, if not of anarchy. The upshot of the discussions of that year settled it that the votes were to be counted by the two houses of Congress, and the Electoral Bill made minute provisions for all questions of disputed returns and differences of opinion during the count between the two houses. But the bill was a mere temporary device, and no permanent measure has yet been passed. This is the more remarkable inasmuch as it is a solitary *casus omissus* in our electoral system. In all the States there are minute legislative provisions for the determination of election disputes over the meanest offices; where statutes do not exist, the courts deal with the subject by *quo warranto*. It is only when we reach the highest office in the country that we find a total absence of precautionary measures. Every step relating to a Presidential contest is left vague and uncertain, as if to invite and to ensure trouble.

Here, too, there is no great difficulty in providing a remedy, and the present Congress has undertaken to provide one. Both houses, we believe, have referred the matter to committees, and Senator Edmunds, from the Select Senate Committee on Presidential Elections, has recently reported a carefully-drawn bill to provide against the recurrence of any troubles like those of 1876. It requires the appointment of electors in each State on the first Tuesday of October (a month earlier than under the present law); prohibits the appointment of any Senator, Representative, or person holding an office of trust or profit under the United States; directs the electors of each State to meet and cast their votes on the second Monday of

the January next following; allows each State to provide by laws (which must be enacted prior to the day fixed for the appointment of electors) for "the trial and determination of any controversy concerning the appointment of electors before the time fixed for the meeting of the electors in any manner it shall deem expedient." Every such determination so made, and made prior to the time of meeting of the electors, "shall be conclusive evidence of the lawful title of the electors" so determined, "and shall govern in the counting of the electoral votes" by Congress. Section five requires the executive of each State to make out and certify three lists of the electors thus ascertained, and to deliver them to the electors on or before the day fixed for their meeting. Other sections provide that Congress shall be in session, on the second Monday in February succeeding every meeting of the electors, in the Hall of Representatives (the President of the Senate presiding), and shall proceed to count the votes by tellers. The President of the Senate is to open the certificates and hand them to the tellers. Further provision is made for objections "to the certificates." These must be in writing, duly authenticated, and are to be submitted to each house separately. In the case of single returns, no electoral vote is to be rejected except by an affirmative vote of both houses. In the case of double returns, the determination of the State tribunals is to govern the count; but in case of a conflict between the State tribunals, only those electoral votes are to be counted which come from the electoral college decided by a concurrent vote of both houses to have the support of the lawful tribunals of the State; in case no determination has been made by the State, then also for any counting a concurrent affirmative vote is required.

This measure is a wise one, and deserves to pass. It probably comes as near settling the great question of double returns as is possible for a human political device. In the first place, every State has three whole months between the elections and meeting of the electors to determine by means of its own tribunal all such questions as arose in 1876 in the three disputed Southern States; and every State may pass what laws it pleases providing for such a contingency. The difficulty in such a State as Florida in 1876 was that no conclusive proceedings to test the title of the rival electoral bodies were possible. In case of the passage of this bill, all Florida will have to do will be to pass a law making it possible for the courts, or some other tribunal, to decide any questions that may arise. The decision of the State is also made binding on Congress in the case of double returns. In the case of double returns where there has been no determination by the State, the practical effect of the bill will be that the vote will not be counted at all, and it cannot be said that after such a natural result of a total neglect of opportunities this would be a very great hardship. It is practically the case of no election in the State.

"MEXICANIZATION."

THERE was much not unnatural alarm before the last election about the "Mexicanization" of our Government, apropos of the Southern practice of carrying elections by intimidation. To carry elections by intimidation is undoubtedly a Mexican practice, but it is nevertheless true that the English constitution, which may be called the progenitor or model of all free governments now in existence, and in many ways the most successful of them, has either been built up by or grown up in spite of elections carried through influences which were intimidation in some form or another—that is, the coercion of tenants by landlords and of laborers by employers. So that, though the Mexicans resort to the practice, it is not a distinctively Mexican practice, nor does even the prolonged use of it necessarily cause the "Mexicanization" of a government or the destruction of either liberty or security. True "Mexicanization" consists in the spread among the voters of both parties of the belief that the Government can only be carried on by one party, and that if the other party gets into power it ought to be resisted as a foreign invader and driven out by force of arms if necessary. Any man who thinks this may feel sure that he is a Mexican; any politician who preaches

it is a Mexican; the black broadcloth and prunella gaiters and stovepipe hat cannot disguise him. If by party government in a free country he means government by one party only, and treats the other party as a public enemy, whose advent to power would ruin his country, he might as well put on embroidered breeches, silver spurs, and a sombrero, and go cockfighting on Sundays.

The application of this to the present situation is not difficult. The Democratic party, both as regards its composition and its policy, in so far as it can be said to have a policy, is as obnoxious to us as it can be to any of our readers—is more so to us, indeed, we have little doubt, than it is to most of our readers. But it comprises very nearly, if not quite, one-half the voters of the Republic. It cannot be disfranchised; it cannot be expelled from the country; it cannot be kept for ever in opposition. The American Government is a party government, which means that it is a government which either of at least two parties can carry on, and which any party that can get a majority on its side, whether it be as virtuous as we should like or as safe as we should like or not, has a right to carry on. To believe in this thoroughly, and to be willing to act on it under all circumstances, is American; to deny it and declare that unless one party, composed of the good and wise—the "bien pensants," as the French Legitimists call them—retains constant possession of power our institutions cannot last, is Mexican, and is a constant incentive to civil war. Mexicanism is not civil war; it is not any overt act whatever; it is a state of mind, a way of looking at political affairs, which makes civil war always possible and prevents all internal reform. Internal reform is not possible, no genuine progress is possible, in a country in which every election, or every unpleasant move, however legal, on the part of the other party is treated as the probable beginning of a revolution or as a fair excuse for armed resistance. We have for these reasons scouted and ridiculed the cry raised by so many Republicans that the Democratic investigation now pending was a revolutionary move and might call for civil war. It is this, and not the investigation, which is Mexican, for the investigation is perfectly legal and constitutional. Says a usually sensible paper, the *Philadelphia Bulletin*:

"The *Nation* attempts to prove the insincerity of those persons who profess to apprehend revolution by the fact that in spite of all their expressed fears they have not begun to barricade their houses. This is a powerful argument, coming from a journal that assumes to have the destinies of the country under its guardianship. A good many wise people believed in 1860 that a great revolutionary movement was impending, but if any one of them filled his parlor with loaded double-barrel guns and had iron armor put upon his front door, the fact has not yet been revealed."

A "great revolutionary movement" was impending in 1860; there was no concealment about it. Many States announced openly, Mexican fashion, that if a certain election went against them they would throw off their allegiance to the Government and make another republic, and they believed they would succeed. They failed, however, miserably, and after awful loss and suffering. If that experience had had no effect on them, and they were now ready to revolt again, it would be not Mexican, or even Caffre, but something still lower, say Comanche. It would show that their mental processes and ideals were below those of the higher order of savages. To keep declaring that it has had no effect on them, and that they are ready for another war, is Mexican talk; it is not Anglo-Saxon talk.

But what the Democrats are doing now, however foolish or mischievous, is strictly legal. The majority of the House are carrying on an enquiry into the conduct of certain high officials in a Presidential election. This is a constitutional proceeding; it is as constitutional and as safe as what the Tories are doing to-day in England. Anybody who thinks it will lead to revolution, and keeps calling on his neighbor to prepare for it, ought to set an example of preparation himself, if he is sincere; for a conflict between the Democrats and Republicans now would not be, as in 1860, a sectional war; it would be a county and town war, a war in which neighbors and friends all over the country would be arrayed against each

other. Anybody who believes that this is impending either believes the American Government has totally failed already, and is, therefore, a very silly pessimist, or is a true Mexican, who believes that civil war is a proper or but slightly objectionable accompaniment of every election. He ought in either case to "fill his parlor with double-barrelled guns and put iron armor on his front door"; he is foolish enough for either precaution.

But, it will be said, since the Democratic party is, as you admit, a dangerous and mischievous party, what is the harm of working on people's imaginations about it and frightening them with pictures of dreadful things that will happen if it gets into power? The first objection is the one we have already set forth: that it helps to Mexicanize the public mind and prepare large bodies of thoughtless persons for remedies outside of the law and the Constitution. Made up as our society is now, such talk is very pernicious and may greatly increase the difficulties with which we have already to contend. The second is, that this plan of suppressing the Democrats has now been tried for ten years, and has proved a total failure. Many Republicans talk—some doubtless think—about the Democratic majority in the House, which is now so troublesome and menacing, as if it had been created by some trick or *coup de main*, as if Potter and Randall and the rest of them had obtained their seats and their power by rushing into the House when no one was looking and declaring themselves representatives of the American people. The unpleasant truth is, however, that they are there because they got majorities in their districts, and they are formidable because they have about half the American people at their back, and for no other reason. When the Republican Congressional Committee sends out a circular asking the Government clerks for \$12 75 apiece to prevent the election of a Democratic House, which they say "would precipitate upon the country dangerous agitations," what they fear is not that the Democrats will seize the House, but that a Democratic majority will be elected by the voters. It is among the voters, therefore, that the Democratic majority is to be attacked; and on them the Republicans have been trying their present tactics ever since 1868—that is, trying to keep possession of power by describing the dreadful things that would happen if the Democrats got into power. Here is the result, which is worth studying, and it is to be observed that it has been gradually brought about with "the machine" in full activity, with General Grant in the White House as a "saviour of society," and with "the bloody shirt" waving freely—with, in short, all those instrumentalities in use which we are urged to keep on trying:

REPUBLICAN STRENGTH IN CONGRESS.

1870—Majority in Senate.....	50	1874—Senate.....	27
" " House.....	97	House.....	105
Total.....	147	Total.....	132
1871—Senate.....	40	1875—Senate majority.....	11
House.....	35	House minority.....	74
Total.....	75	Minority.....	63
1872—Senate.....	30	1876—Senate majority.....	17
House.....	25	House minority.....	77
Total.....	55	Minority.....	60
1873 (after the Greeley farce)—Senate.....	25	1877—Senate majority.....	2
House.....	103	House minority.....	13
Total.....	128	Minority.....	11

Nothing could show more clearly than this that the bulk of the voters are not afraid of the Democrats as a mere Mexican bugbear, and do not believe they will overturn the Government or reduce us to the level of Mexico, and nothing can therefore be more futile than renewing this now familiar cry and relying on it. The Democrats must be attacked in the minds of the people, on the assumption that the majority desire good, orderly, and progressive government and by a party which is itself united, and has a programme of its own which commends itself to the intelligence and social aims and ambitions of the industrious classes, who after all are the supreme bestowers of power, and who cannot be permanently humbugged or frightened. This country cannot be governed very long by any party by working on people's fears; something must be done

for their hopes. The generation which was shocked by the war and still looks for the rebels in every bush is passing away or growing old. The new one cannot be led to the polls by the Hales and Blaines and Gorhams and Conklings in heavy marching order, and they are the worst enemies of the Republican party and of good government who keep pretending that they hear the cannon every time the Democrats make a foolish use of constitutional power.

LODGINGS FOR SINGLE WOMEN.

IT would be a great pity if the flippant rant of the speakers at the Cooper Union last week, denouncing Judge Hilton's abandonment of the working-women's hotel, were allowed to divert attention from the real merits of that remarkable performance. It is admitted that Judge Hilton—he nominally acts in Mrs. Stewart's name, but so nominally that in discussing the matter she may as well be left out of sight—was not legally bound to build or carry on a hotel for the use of working-women. He was, as his action has shown, perfectly free not to open the building to women exclusively at all. He might have made it what it is now on the very day it was finished, and might have tried the experiment of the women's hotel in any manner he pleased. The gorgeous furniture, the fine library, and the general elaboration of the fittings—all the things, in short, except the building itself, which made the enterprise expensive, were of his own contriving. He might have made the furniture very simple, and the accommodation of all kinds so plain that he need not have charged six dollars for rooms and board. He might, too, have put closets in the rooms and have run a rail round the cornice, on which the inmates could have hung pictures without damaging the walls, and have allowed them to have sewing-machines and birds and flowers, and even have permitted "visiting around" among guests of the hotel without any restriction. The whole matter was within his control. So that when he opened the kind of establishment he did open, and fixed the price so high that the community could not furnish enough female boarders who could pay it, and made the rooms in one way or another so inconvenient that even those who could pay the rent were not willing to live in them, the conclusion is not unfair that he never intended that the experiment should succeed. In short, he doomed it to failure from the beginning. If it had been entered on as a business enterprise, his abandoning it and converting the building to another use would be so completely his own affair or the affair of the Stewart estate that the public would have nothing to say about it. But the building was begun for a charitable use in Mr. Stewart's lifetime. What this use was his representatives have since his death explained to the world, and that Mr. Stewart imposed the execution of his designs on them as a moral trust, their opening of the hotel is a sufficient acknowledgment. That their opening it under such conditions that the persons for whose benefit it was designed either would not or could not avail themselves of it, would of itself raise a presumption that the executors meant to evade this moral obligation, they being unquestionably well acquainted with the habits and needs of the working-women who were expected to fill the hotel. This would be true, even if the hotel were now turned over to some other kind of charity—if, that is to say, Judge Hilton were to deal with it under what the lawyers call the *cy-pris* rule, which directs that when a charitable bequest cannot for any reason be applied to the object to which the testator directs its application, it shall be applied to some object as nearly resembling it in character as possible. But when all pretence of using the building for any charitable object is given up, and it is converted to purely commercial uses, the presumption rises into positive proof of perversion—not legal perversion which can be corrected by the courts, but moral perversion which the public ought to visit with condemnation. When a man proclaims himself the holder of property left in his hands by a deceased person for a public use he virtually pledges himself to the public to execute the trust, if not in the manner the testator had in mind, in the best manner he can. He has no right to say that the testator was a visionary, and that he is going to use the money in trade; if the bequest were a legal one made in a will, the courts would not allow him to do this; when it is a mere moral legacy the community ought to see that he does not do it with impunity.

But Judge Hilton's refusal to do anything at all ought not to blind us to the difficulties of what he undertook to do. There has been a great deal of abuse heaped upon him for attempting to impose any restrictions on his female boarders except such as he would impose on the inmates of an ordinary hotel, and a large part of the time of the meeting at the Cooper Union the other night was devoted to showing that it was ridicu-

lous to ask women to submit to any restraints on their liberty to which men are not usually asked to submit, and that nobody *would* ask it but a conceited and tyrannical man. To this he has made an easy answer by producing the rules of the boarding-houses carried on by the Young Women's Christian Association in this city, which are in fact more stringent than his, and a correspondent showed in the last number of the *Nation* that similar rules are in force in the very successful boarding-houses of the Young Women's Christian Association of Boston. That is to say, the best women, and those who are the most anxious to help the less fortunate ones of their own sex, agree with heartless and greedy and obtuse men, such as Judge Hilton is charged with being, in thinking that if you set up a lodging-house for women exclusively, you must, in order to make it effective, conduct it in a very different manner from a lodging-house designed for men exclusively.

When one comes to enquire the reason of this opinion one finds himself treading on some very hot embers of controversy, or rather the hot embers of several controversies. One finds himself at once in danger of collision with the friends of the political equality of the sexes, and with those who think women ought to pursue all callings in common with men, and with those who think boys and girls ought to be educated together under exactly the same régime in all schools and colleges. Working-women who come to the cities now to earn their living, and for whose relief these charitable enterprises are designed, and do live now in vast numbers in cheap lodgings, have to submit to no such restrictions. The very fact of their supporting themselves furnishes them, it is said, with a valid title to decide what is necessary for their physical or moral welfare—that is, for the preservation of their health and reputation—and any attempt to supersede their discretion in the matter is an odious bit of petty tyranny on the part of those who try to help them. But the fact that women lead wholly independent lives (that is, lives exempt from surveillance) who come to great cities to earn their bread, is one of the reasons why the benevolent of their own sex are so anxious to provide them with lodgings where some sort of surveillance would be exercised. That is to say, most thoughtful women, as well as most thoughtful men, recognize that women, in their efforts to be independent and self-supporting, are weighted in the race by two very unpleasant facts: one is that a woman's reputation is a far more delicate thing than a man's, easier to damage, and if damaged, harder to restore; and that, therefore, everything that makes it easier for her to take care of it—such as the possession of a well-ordered home and the society of friends—is an invaluable aid to her under any circumstances, and if she is called on to earn her own living, it must inevitably relieve her, if she is a right-minded person, of much heavy care and trouble. By living in a properly-regulated boarding-house, and submitting to a few restrictions on her liberty, she not only obtains a very useful certificate of character, but is relieved of all sorts of small precautions, the provision of which would otherwise devolve on her. The other is, that not only is her reputation a more delicate thing than a man's, but that it is the object of persistent and yet disguised attack on the part of men: in other words, it is assailed by persons whose society is naturally and properly agreeable to her, through emotions and affections which are in themselves not only harmless, and even praiseworthy, but which constitute part of what is best and noblest in her nature. Her position, in fact, somewhat resembles that of a young man whose enjoyment of another young man's society constituted a constant temptation to commit theft which both of them had great difficulty in resisting, and, indeed, surrounded theft with an atmosphere of poetry and romance, and associated it closely with what was most beautiful and attractive in nature and art, and made music and painting and fine scenery in some sense an incentive to it. If men were tempted in this way to courses which worked either moral ruin or led to the loss of public confidence in their rectitude, there would be no more objection to their receiving aids to virtue in the shape of domestic restraints on their liberty than there is now to their being held to strict accountability through book-keeping and vouchers in money matters; and the aids would be offered, and by the wise as cheerfully accepted as an upright man now accepts the obligation to keep accounts of his dealings with other people's funds.

The growing disposition and growing competence of women to earn their own bread, even if it involves leaving their homes to seek their fortune in the world, have been undoubtedly accompanied by some modification on the part of the public in the laws of what is called "propriety," but there has been no such modification as to make the position of a working-woman earning from three to ten dollars a week in a great city, and living in such private lodgings as her means bring within her reach,

anything but perilous and uncomfortable. Those who know most of the experience of women in this plight paint it in the darkest colors. That any good discipline, any preparation for better things, is to be got out of it is a delusion, and the very things that make city life attractive, the temptations to dress and amusement which it constantly offers, aggravate its evils. There could, therefore, hardly be a better use for the money and labor of the philanthropic than the provision of homes for such women, such as it was generally supposed Mr. Stewart was about to offer. Every large city ought to contain them in abundance, but they ought to offer nothing in the shape of luxury to those whose wages put luxury beyond their reach. At the same time it is not necessary that the rates of board should be high enough to pay for all that is given. There is no doubt that the only sound basis for such establishments is the commercial basis, but the basis would be sufficiently commercial for all purposes of moral training if every woman paid what her wages enabled her to pay, and if all that she received in return, over and above what she paid for, was order, care in sickness, advice and protection in difficulty, and the comforts which come from good organization and purchases on a large scale. That such a sum as has been put into the Stewart Hotel should be diverted from such an object as this, and used to add another "first-class hotel" to the large number of bankrupt or poorly-patronized concerns of the kind which the city already contains, cannot but be regarded as a great public misfortune, and it certainly calls for more serious treatment than the silly abuse heaped on Judge Hilton at the indignation meeting.

THE SOUVENIRS OF DANIEL STERN.

PARIS, May 17.

IT is quite true that few books can be as interesting as good memoirs. Truth is always, or often at least, better than imagination. I confess that I have but a limited admiration for the works of Madame d'Agoult, who wrote under the singular name of Daniel Stern. I doubt if many have read her 'Essay on Liberty,' her 'Florence and Turin,' her 'Nelida,' her 'Jeanne d'Arc.' Her 'History of the Beginning of the Republic of the Netherlands,' 1581 to 1625, shows a vigorous mind, as well as her 'History of the Revolution of 1848'—a book which is truly masculine in its accent, and is not without merit, though it hardly deserves to be ranked among the historical works of our time.

I began almost with reluctance, and certainly not without great diffidence, the 'Souvenirs of Madame d'Agoult,' and I was very agreeably surprised to find that the true woman at heart appeared in this last work. How different was this Madame d'Agoult, who lived from 1806 to 1833, from the Daniel Stern whom we have all seen, if not known, from the friend and associate of some of our most advanced *littérateurs* and politicians, who spent her last years in the society of Louis de Ronchaud, to whom the 'Souvenirs' are dedicated, of Neftzer, the editor of the *Temps*, of Charles Dollfus, of Émile Ollivier, who tried to reconcile the Empire with liberty. Few women were seen in the salon of Daniel Stern, though she had become old, though her hair had quite turned grey, and though she never allowed the tone of her house to be anything but solemn and almost severe. Alas! she had not governed her life after the ordinary rules; she had wandered far from the paths of ordinary life; she had sinned against the laws of the world; and, as she says in her preface, "when a woman has made for herself her life, and when that life is not governed after the common rule, she becomes responsible for it—more responsible than a man—in the eyes of all. When such a woman, by the effect of chance or of talent, ceases to be obscure she contracts at once masculine duties."

Daniel Stern conceives that one of these duties is to write an autobiography. In the volume which is before me, however, the author does not attempt to explain the errors of her life. I suspect that Madame d'Agoult was not in the same mood as so many men and women who take pride in their errors; she did not triumph over the world like Madame Sand, like Jean Jacques Rousseau. Though she has a somewhat masculine style, she was after all a true woman; she was weak, or, at any rate, she knew that the world was strong. How she allowed herself to leave the paths of conventionality seems almost incredible to us; she must have been acting as in a dream, and when she woke up she found herself quite miserable. She longed for all that she had lost with an incredible longing; her whole being suffered acutely—her innate sense of decency, her intense aristocratic vanity, her family pride, her love of admiration. She felt like a queen in exile, who has lost her rank; she kept her queenly manners among the people who surrounded her, but they were not those among whom she had been born and bred. She could not conceive why

the world had been more severe towards her than towards other great ladies who had broken the ties of matrimony; she wanted the boldness of some sinners, their quiet assurance; she wanted also the support of a powerful family, as her family had turned against her and abandoned her. It is necessary to keep in mind this dramatic state of the author's mind in order to enjoy fully the reading of these 'Souvenirs.' They are, so to speak, the "super flumina Babylonis" of a wounded soul, which is looking for solace and comfort in the memories of a past and distant youth, and which is studying another and better self. A severe critic might ridicule the affectation with which this author of the 'History of the Revolution of 1848' explains the origin of her family. How she delights in saying that she can find traces of the Flavignys in an old poem of the thirteenth century, in the Bible of Guiot de Provins! The Flavignys are mentioned with the Courtenays, the Duchastels, the D'Aspremonts, the Joinvilles; they bear "cehiqueté d'argent et d'azur, à l'écusson de gueules en abyme."

Her father was an officer in the French army. When the Revolution broke out he followed his brother-officers to Coblenz. Prince Louis de la Trémoille gave him the brevet of colonel in the army of the Princes, and M. de Flavigny was sent to Frankfort-on-the-Main, with the mission of organizing a regiment. He there became acquainted with the Bethmann family, and a young widow of this family became enamored of the French officer, and, after much opposition on the part of all the Bethmanns, married him. Flavigny and his wife remained in Germany till the year 1809, when they bought an estate in Touraine. They had three children, two sons and a daughter, who was born in 1805.

Madame d'Agoult tells with much charm the history of her early years in Touraine. At the age of ten, when Bonaparte returned from the island of Elba, she was taken to Frankfort, and she describes the Bethmann family, "die alte Frau von Bethmann," her grandmother, her uncle Moritz, the hospitality of the Baslerhofs, the Hollweggs. One day she was in the garden with some young friends, and saw an old man, who was accompanied by the whole family with much respect. Her cousin told her, "Es ist der Herr von Goethe." Goethe spoke to her a moment and caressed her flowing hair.

In 1816 she returned to France, and the work of her education began in earnest. This education was ended in the famous Convent of the Sacré Cœur in Paris, which is still as Madame d'Agoult describes it, though it is threatened on all sides by the new streets and boulevards of Paris. She left the convent almost with reluctance; her father was no more, she was sixteen years old, she was very handsome, she was an heiress. This is how she describes herself: "Tall, slender, with a natural nobility in all my movements, a complexion as brilliant as snow, great blue eyes, limpid, fair and abundant hair, a thoughtful smile, I looked like a princess of the legends of the Rhine or of the ballads of Schiller." Madame d'Agoult had the vanity of beauty with an intensity and a simplicity which are almost touching; the consciousness or the memory of her beauty seems to have filled all her life. But I agree with her, "that some fondness of past beauty is the most natural and the most inoffensive sentiment in the world." This young Princess of the Rhine had not yet "what was French in her—the precision in the lines of the forehead, of the nose, of the mouth, the proud walk, the easy laugh"; this came afterwards. Such as she was, she had to make her *entrée* in the world under the auspices of an adoring mother. She did not herself adore her mother. "Her presence," she says, "was not agreeable to me, though she was for me nothing but indulgence. I would not have thought of opening my heart to her. I obeyed her in all my actions; she had no hold on my thoughts." The smell of the convent was not gone yet; the young beauty had a very exalted piety, and she suffered in the thought that her mother was a Protestant. She little thought at the time that her mother would afterwards become a Catholic, and that she would herself renounce all forms of Christianity and adopt philosophy as her religion!

She was married, as she says, "à la française": she was chosen, she did not choose. I will not enter here into the theoretical question of the "mariage à la française." It is enough to say that Madame d'Agoult, if she was the victim of an unfortunate fashion, could only accuse herself. She herself says that in the world where she lived she had remarked and preferred a peer of France, General Count de Lagarde, though he was forty-five years old. The general admired her and loved her without declaring his love. He came one day, on the eve of his departure for the waters of Gastein.

"When I entered the room M. de Lagarde was taking leave of my mother. I advanced towards him, and giving my hand to him—

'I am going,' said he, and I felt tears coming to my eyes—'Yes,' said he, looking intently at me; and as I was silent, 'I am going,' said he again, and he added with a trembling voice, 'I go . . . unless you order me to stay.' Stay! . . . this word so short, this word which decided all my existence, it came, as rapid as thought, to my lips; I felt it there vibrating and trembling . . . and there it expired. It died in an incredible suicide of love and of will. . . . Somebody came. M. de Lagarde went out. I went back to my room. I heard the carriage roll slowly under the archway; all was said. I put my head in my hand and sobbed."

And in consequence of this little incident, the beautiful Mademoiselle de Flavigny, after having looked with indifference on hundreds of adorers, was conducted to the altar by a man who was chosen by her family, by Count Charles d'Agoult, Colonel of Cavalry, nephew of the first Querry of Madame la Dauphine, allied to the ancient houses of Castellan, of Sabran, of Simiane, of Forbin-Janson, etc. The King, Charles X.; the Dauphin, the Dauphine; Marie-Caroline, Duchess of Berry; the Duke of Orleans, the Duchess of Orleans, Madame Adélaïde, signed at her contract.

The best chapters of the 'Souvenirs' are the descriptions of the society of the Faubourg St. Germain just before the Revolution of 1831, and the presentations of the young countess to the little circles of the court. They are like those charming pictures and engravings of the end of the eighteenth century, in which a forgotten world seems to revive. It was the rule that the newly-married ladies should be presented in great ceremony. They were assisted by two *marraines*, and generally took lessons from M. Abraham, the dancing-master of the court. M. Abraham gave three lessons to Madame d'Agoult; he taught her to make the proper courtesies with the court-mantle. I will not attempt to describe the toilette; Madame d'Agoult, by special favor, was first presented in the *petits appartemens* to the Dauphine. "Coming straight to me, the Dauphine looks at me from head to foot, turns to the Viscountess d'Agoult, 'She has not enough red,' says she with a trenchant air; and, without saying a word more, she goes out as she had come, with a thundering rapidity. 'How did I not see it?' says the viscountess, looking herself at me, without showing the least astonishment at the singular reception of the Princess." There was no remedy; the apartments of the King were opened, and the young Countess, with the Viscountess d'Agoult on one side, the Duchess of Montmorency on the other, in one line made her low, profound, slow, and triple courtesy to His Majesty, Charles X. "Charles X., though he was seventy years old, had a certain *air de jeunesse*, with the indescribable *je ne sais quoi* of the French gentleman, when he has been much admired by the ladies. He was thin, slender, straight. Neither in the long oval of his face, nor in his oblique forehead, nor in his vague eyes, nor even in his white hair, was there anything which spoke of beauty or true authority; but the ensemble of it all seemed noble and graceful."

The soirées of the Dauphine, to which the young viscountess was admitted, were very solemn affairs. The Dauphine used to work at some tapestry; on both sides of her chair ladies were seated according to their rank. They only spoke to their neighbors, and in a very low voice. The Princess occasionally spoke loudly, and put a question; the answer was short, and the silence began again. The Dauphin invariably played at chess with the Viscountess d'Agoult, his old friend of Mitau. In another corner Charles X. played silently at whist with three of his gentlemen; when he retired, the whole company retired. Madame d'Agoult describes admirably the daughter of Louis XVI.; the stern Duchess d'Angoulême; the Duke d'Angoulême, the hero of the Trocadero; the Duke and the Duchess de Berry (the mother of the present Count de Chambord); her relations were such pure *ultras* that she was allowed to see little of the Palais Royal, where the Duke d'Orléans received the Liberals of the Restoration. The *salons* where she lived chiefly were the *salons*, now forgotten, of the Princess de la Trémoille, of the Marchioness de Montcalm, of the Montmorencys. She was allowed to go to Madame de Duras, to the Duchess de Narbonne, to the Duchess de Maillé, and to Madame Récamier.

The Revolution of 1830 ended this first act of an existence which was so different in its beginning and in its end. The fondness with which Madame d'Agoult has described her life when she was engaged in the regular hierarchy of society, shows how she remained always attached to the world with whom she broke with so much *éclat*. She is almost spiteful in her last chapters towards Madame Récamier and Madame de Staël, forgetting that Madame Récamier, though she was always courted, led the purest of lives, and that Madame de Staël, besides being a woman of genius, was always supported by a powerful family; she offended the

world, but never left the world, which is the offence the world will not and cannot forgive.

On the whole, these "Souvenirs" are, like most souvenirs, a melancholy book; it is painful to see the best gifts of nature, beauty, fortune, eloquence, wit, thrown away at the feet of some unworthy idol. But some chapters of this last work of Daniel Stern are really worthy of preservation, as minute and exact copies of the best French society in the later parts of the Restoration.

Notes.

THE author of a 'Life of Poe,' Mr. Eugene L. Didier, has in preparation a 'History of American Publishers,' full of gossip about men and books, anecdote, and biography, for which he invites suggestions and information. It will be illustrated with portraits. Mr. Didier's address is Monumental Library, 185 Madison Ave., Baltimore.—A 'Life of John Fitch, the Steamboat Inspector,' is in the press of J. B. Lippincott & Co.—Alfred Martien, Philadelphia, will shortly publish 'The Law of Marriage, Divorce, Breach of Promise, and Rights of Married Women in the United States.'—The Society for Photographing Relics of Old London announces as the subjects of its fourth year's series Temple Bar; Gate and Courtyard of 103 Leadenhall Street (demolished in 1875); Houses in Gray's Inn Lane (demolished 1878); Shop in Brewer St., Soho; The "Sir Paul Pindar," Bishopsgate Street; Houses in Holborn. These views are permanent, in size 10 in. by 8 in., and may be had for the annual subscription of 10 shillings sixpence by addressing Mr. Alfred Marks, Long Ditton, Surrey.—We have received the first volume of Dr. F. Ratzel's work on the geography of the United States—the physical section—and are informed that the author requests for use in preparing his second volume (on social geography, or *Culturegeographie*) any late and fresh statistical information upon population, railroads, trade, commerce, industry, education. It may be sent him direct, at the Technische Hochschule, Munich, or through Prof. Adolph Werner, at the College of the City of New York. In the *Academy* of May 25 may be found some account of another work of Dr. Ratzel's, published three years ago, and not without its interest for Americans, on Chinese emigration (*Die chinesische Auswanderung*).—A very fair portrait of Mr. Edison, showing also distinctly his phonograph, is given in the June number of the *N. Y. Revista Industrial*. Mr. Edison's latest invention—an ear-trumpet for carrying on conversations at a distance of two miles or more in the open air—he calls a telegraphophone. The achievement, wonderful as it is, seems less so than the name.—American engineers who attend the Paris Exposition have a strong inducement to visit Germany also, where a cordial reception awaits them at the hands of the Society of German Engineers and the Prussian Minister of Commerce. In Paris itself the Society of Civil Engineers of France offers "a hospitality worthy of our American colleagues." A circular of particulars has been issued by Mr. Thomas S. Drown, of Easton, Pa., Secretary of the American Institute of Mining Engineers.—It appears that the cable was in error in representing the report of the British Copyright Commission as unanimous. A number of minority reports have been made.—All of the late George Cruikshank's books, a great part of his prints, and a portion of his drawings and sketches were sold at auction last month and brought high prices. Some tiny Falstaff water-color drawings brought separately as much as \$150 in two instances. The oil paintings fared not so well. There will be additional sales next winter. Cruikshank's pension has been continued to his widow.—A Platt-deutsche gathering has been held this week at Stuttgart with a view to raising the sum yet required to erect a monument to Fritz Reuter at Neu-Brandenburg. The *Athenæum* states that the subscription has been dragging for four years.—In *Polybiblion* for May M. J. Vaesen begins a series of papers on the public libraries of the United States, based on the Centennial volume of the Bureau of Education.—The second number of Georg Ebers's 'Egypt Illustrated and Described' ('Ägypten in Bild und Wort') has just appeared. The work is to comprise about thirty-six numbers and be enriched with some seven hundred illustrations. We may also note the appearance of the first number of the second volume of J. A. Vullers's edition of the 'Shah-name' (Leiden), and a treatise by M. Schneidewin, 'Homeric Naïveté, an æsthetic-culture historical study.'

—The centennial celebration of the establishment of the first academy incorporated in this country was observed last Wednesday and Thursday, 5th and 6th of June, by the Phillips Academy, of Andover, Mass.

Though Master Moody's famous Dummer Academy at Byfield was opened to pupils in 1763 it was not incorporated till 1782; and the act of incorporation of the Phillips Exeter Academy in New Hampshire followed by three years that granted to the Andover school. Phillips Academy was founded in 1778 by Judge Samuel Phillips, a graduate of Harvard College in 1771, for a time one of its overseers, and for twenty years the president of the Massachusetts Senate. His purpose was to establish a school fitted to instruct youth "not only in English and Latin grammar, writing, arithmetic, and those sciences wherein they are commonly taught, but more especially to learn them the great end and real business of living." Of such a purpose the history of the school has been worthy. Its students have numbered more than nine thousand, and three thousand of them have entered college. A large proportion of its graduates for the last thirty years it has sent to Yale, as the Exeter school has constantly sent the majority of its students to Harvard. In the list of its alumni are fifteen college presidents, and one hundred professors in colleges and professional schools. Among them are President Woods of Bowdoin, Stearns of Amherst, Kirkland and Quincy of Harvard, Professor Young of Princeton and Marsh of Yale and Churchill of Andover. Many of its students have also become distinguished in literature. N. P. Willis was a member of the school in 1821, and Oliver Wendell Holmes in 1824-25. Of such a history the anniversary exercises of last week were abundantly worthy. The oration of the Rev. Alexander McKenzie, of Cambridge, was mainly historical, but also considered the relation of the academy to the college. The poem of Dr. Holmes was a picture of school-life on Andover Hill fifty years ago; and, although pitched on a lighter key, deserves to be placed side by side with Mr. Longfellow's "Mortuiri Salutamus." Dr. Holmes also delighted his audience, at the dinner, by the reading of a brief translation made when, a boy of fifteen, he was a member of the school. An alumni association was organized; and the sum of \$50,000 was raised towards an endowment fund, one half of which, continuing the liberality of the family whose name the school bears, was given by Mr. John C. Phillips, of Boston.

—Theodore Thomas's concerts at Gilmore's Garden began a fortnight ago, but it is perhaps too soon to judge of the probable success of this second attempt to attract popular audiences by thoroughly good music. The attempt has been made under different conditions from those which surrounded the first experiment at the Central Park Garden. There the place of amusement was a good way off, while the hall was small and adapted to concert music. Now the building is in the centre of the city, but it is of vast capacity; it must be tolerably well filled every night to pay, and it is not well fitted for hearing stringed instruments. This difficulty has been partly got over by railing off a considerable space in front of the orchestra, where it can be easily heard, and filling it with reserved seats for those who come to hear rather than to look on. Outside, however, go circling round and round the throng who come primarily to see what is going on, and the noise which their promenading makes is not a particularly good accompaniment for the music. A screen of moderate height erected behind the band would be worth trying. The music was announced in advance as of a popular character, and in a certain sense the promise is being fulfilled. Liszt's "Préludes," Wagner's "Tannhäuser March," Gounod's "Funeral March of a Marionette," are all popular with those whose ear has been sufficiently cultivated to know good music from bad; but we greatly fear that the musical education of a majority of the audiences which go to Gilmore's Garden has not carried them farther than the appreciation of "Home, Sweet Home" and "Champagne Charlie." In deference to popular taste Mr. Thomas has wisely secured the services of an able "cornetist," M. Shuebruck, who is certainly a capital player, and whose execution of variations on well-known airs always meets with great approval. As formerly at Central Park Garden, Mr. Thomas's Thursday evening programmes are quite classical; and it is to be hoped that the evident drawbacks of the present garden will not prevent really musical people from giving a hearty support to the enterprise.

—One of the minor compositions with which Mr. Thomas has this season pleased his audiences was a minuet by Boccherini, a composer of the last half of the eighteenth century whose name is now seldom seen on programmes. It is perhaps not generally known that he wrote no less than three hundred and sixty-six instrumental works, among them twenty symphonies and one hundred and thirteen quintets for two violins, viola, and two cellos. Better known are the facts that Handel wrote about fifty operas, all of which are now dead, and that of Haydn's one hundred and eighteen symphonies only about a dozen are occasionally played now. Schubert wrote more than six hundred songs, about one-half of which are

unknown or forgotten. Rossini manufactured thirty-eight, and Donizetti more than sixty, operas, of most of which scarcely the names are preserved; and other similar instances could be given by the score to show that of making compositions, as of books, there is no end. Now, why is it that of these compositions so many perish, like butterflies, after living a very short season? Partly because music, being the most subjective of the arts, is therefore the most progressive, and keeps altering with the changing intellectual and social phases of society and the growing complexity of our emotional life; but still more because of the reckless over-production of which most creative musicians are guilty. Their conduct is excusable in those cases where there is or was a pecuniary motive for it, but this pecuniary motive rarely existed, as composers are the worst-paid producers in the world, and many of the works of those who were most prolific were either not published at all or only long after their departure. Nor can they have hoped by such a course to improve their chances of immortality. On the contrary, it is evident that they would have greatly improved them by writing less and making that little richer in ideas and more finished in form. Had Handel written six operas instead of fifty, some of them would now perhaps be as popular as his oratorios; and, instead of having two hundred good Schubert songs, we might have at least one hundred more if that prolific writer had made better use of the doubtless great number of valuable ideas which he threw away in the remaining three hundred songs.

—Modern composers must be supposed to be familiar with these statistics and the lessons which they teach. And yet they do not seem to heed them at all. What is apt to strike one most in looking over the new catalogues of foreign music publishers is the rapidity with which the leading musicians produce their works. Their highest ambition appears to be to get as soon as possible beyond Opus 200. The *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* recently asked pertinently, What is posterity to do with all these piles of music? It calls attention to the fact that there are now in Germany alone at least fifty composers whose names are generally known. Among these are twenty-nine opera composers, who, however, setting aside Wagner, have not in the last twenty years produced a single opera that will live. The list of German composers is headed by Wagner, Brahms, Raff, Franz, Rheinberger, Goldmark, Bargiel, Jensen, and we may add Rubinstein, and Liszt, who, though not Germans by birth, are yet thoroughly German as musicians. France adds to these Saint-Saëns, Gounod, Delibes, Joncières, Maillard, Massé, Masseult, Mermet, Offenbach, Thomas, and a host of others whose names usually disappear as quickly as they have come into notice. Of Italians only two, Verdi and Boito, deserve mention, although the smaller opera-writers who furnish all the "one-day flies" are countless in number. Belgium contributes about a dozen, Holland 11, Sweden 10, etc. The *Zeitschrift* points out that if the chances of immortality among composers of the past were 10 per cent., of the living only about 5 per cent. can have any rational hopes that their works will be played in the next century. This consideration certainly ought to make them hesitate in their course, and induce them to elaborate their ideas more carefully. Like their literary cousins who write for our best periodicals, these musicians must sooner or later learn to express themselves always neatly and concisely, to write only when they have something new to say, and to stop short when they have said it. The slovenly form and absence of polish and directness which often affect one so disagreeably in the literature of the Germans is no less conspicuous in much of their music; and it is to be regretted that more of them do not follow Chopin as a model in this respect. Heretical as it may sound, we must add that Mozart has too long been held up as a model of musical elegance by the critics. Nothing could be more aimless often than his cold formalism; nothing more slovenly and wearisome than his constant repetition of meaningless cadences at the end of every short musical phrase.

—Gen. A. A. Humphreys, Chief of the Engineer Department, has addressed a letter to the Chairman of the House Committee on Levees and Improvement of the Mississippi, in opposition to a scheme for surveying the Mississippi from St. Louis to the Gulf, preparing plans to improve navigation and prevent disastrous overflow, and carrying the same into effect. Four of the proposed commission are to be taken from the United States Corps of Engineers, but the fifth from civil life, though he is to be president and to control the decisions of the commission, even as to what projects, plans, or estimates shall be submitted to the President or Secretary of War. General Humphreys thinks this in the interest of Capt. J. B. Eads, who has recently proclaimed his ability to deepen the low-water channel of the Mississippi to twenty feet, and would naturally like to get to work at it as director-in-chief. Not only, however, does he

encroach upon the proper province of the Engineers, who are actually engaged upon the survey of the river for the objects contemplated, but he challenges anew the Department's opinion of his capacity and of his success as shown in the working of the jetties at the South Pass. Gen. Humphreys denies the practicability of the canalization which he contemplates, or that there is any information on which to base an estimate of the extent and cost of works necessary for a twenty-feet low-water channel. As for the jetties at the South Pass, he asserts that the Department's prediction has proved true already, and that the bar-growth formed under their action is more rapid than the old, and can only be kept down by the indefinite extension of the jetties (which is both difficult and extremely expensive in deep water) or by dredging. Dredging has, in fact, been resorted to, as at Southwest Pass—or, in other words, the very thing which Congress sought to dispense with by making the Eads contract. These are serious representations, and should be duly weighed before Captain Eads is allowed the relief on his contract which he has already persuaded the Senate to grant him, and still more before any consideration is given to the larger scheme above described. To get the Mississippi River out of politics is a pressing economy; the getting of it in has cost us nobody knows how much.

—The first number of *Brain*, "a journal of neurology," which is to include in its scope "all that relates to the anatomy, physiology, pathology, and therapeutics of the nervous system," has lately made its appearance in London (Macmillan & Co.) It is to discuss mental phenomena only so far as these are correlated with their anatomical substrata, and mental disease is to be studied "by the methods applicable to nervous diseases in general." It is edited by Drs. Bucknill, Crichton-Browne, Ferrier, and Hughlings-Jackson, and the long list of English and foreign contributors seems to be a sufficient guarantee for the fulfilment of its programme. The first number, however, is somewhat disappointing. The different states of the pupil as symptoms of disease, muscular sense, the rôle of the dura mater in cerebral traumatism, the symptoms of organic brain-disease, the structure and distribution of cortical cells, and skull-mapping, are by no means subjects as yet "inadequately represented in existing medical and scientific serial literature." The only article which is not less indicative of a new departure than the prospectus is that on "Brain Forcing," by Dr. Allbutt. He regards all mental activities from five strictly neurological points of view. The best *quality* of brain is "that structure of cell and fibre which corresponds more widely or intimately with outer conditions, so that by virtue of such relation the individual more readily apprehends things and conceives them. This is genius in the stricter sense." *Quantity* is "the volume of nerve force given off by the brain," without regard to quality. *Tension* is "the power in the nerve action to overcome inner and outer resistance." *Variety* is "the congregation of different centres, and the weaving of mediate strands which gives the possessor not higher or wider, but a greater number of relations with outer things. In common life this is usually called versatility." *Control* is due "subordination of one centre to another, which, if of the lower to the higher, results in obedience to the more permanent order of the universe." Goethe, for instance, it is said, had all these faculties. Schiller "had high quality, tension, and control, but was defective in endurance and in variety. In Keats we recognize quality, tension, and variety in high degrees; control in less measure, and quantity in defect." Of these quality is highest, latest, and (consisting, "as it probably does, in added ganglionic and commissural structure") is least developed, though it is most easily injured by wrong methods of education. Quantity is most—tension, which is dependent on the "tides of the blood-vessels," is least—dependent on physical vigor. Variety is chiefly innate; control is mainly the creature of education. This bold nomenclature—when compared, e.g., with the Cartesianism of Professor Huxley, who prefers to express matter in terms of mind rather than the reverse—is of great significance as indicating how far physiology has come to assume the arbitration of all psychological questions. Hence, as was urged in a late number of *Pflüger's Archiv*, physiology is fast becoming, like "philosophy," too wide and comprehensive a department to be advantageously included in its whole scope by individual workers. Analogies with and possible modes of mental action which are constantly suggested already lend great interest even to the details of the microscopic anatomy of brain-structure as described by Meynert, Flechsig, Luys, and many others. We earnestly hope that the editors of *Brain*, no less than Dr. Allbutt, are fully alive to the vast problem which has made and defined the department of physiological psychology—viz., to determine how far the philosophy of mind can be restated and new-dispensed in terms of neural structure and function.

—Every number of *Nature* since its enlargement has been remarkable for its contents, but the issue for May 23 possesses a peculiar interest. Mr. Francis Galton's paper on "Composite Portraits" gives the latest result of his very original study of the laws of consanguinity and descent. By a process intelligible to any one who understands the first steps in photography he takes upon one and the same plate faint successive images of several card-portraits, arranged in a pack before the camera, and so "registered" (to use a printer's term) that the eyes of each portrait are on a line, and equidistant from an imaginary vertical line between them. For the rest the portraits must have a general similarity in attitude and size, "but no exactness is necessary in either of these respects." What follows can shrewdly be predicted from these conditions: the features which are common to all the portraits will by dint of longest exposure make the strongest impress on the negative, while the different peculiarities will leave little if any trace of themselves. The "composite" thus obtained, when printed, shows a face that would not be suspected of being other than an individual likeness, and which yet bears a resemblance to every one of the members of which it is composed. It is, in short, an abstraction or *type* of these members. Mr. Galton has had engraved, to accompany his paper in *Nature*, a "composite" derived from three components borrowed from the British "rogues' gallery." He remarks in a descriptive note:

"To the best of my judgment the original photograph is a very exact average of its components; not one feature in it appears identical with that of any one of them, but it contains a resemblance to all, and is not more like to one of them than to another. However, the judgment of the wood-engraver is different. His rendering of the composite has made it exactly like one of its components, which it must be borne in mind he had never seen. It is just as though an artist drawing a child had produced a portrait closely resembling its deceased father, having overlooked an equally strong likeness to its deceased mother, which was apparent to its relatives. This is to me a striking proof that the composite is a true combination."

—What are the uses of this discovery? They are many, says Mr. Galton. "They give us typical pictures of different races of men, if derived from a large number of individuals of those races taken at random;" or of strongly-marked selected types, as from the criminal classes. Stranger still, however, we may by means of components obtain "a really good likeness of a living person"—not simply a phase, or an expression, but the essential characteristics. In like manner, portraits of historical personages might be produced from contemporaneous coins, medals, statues or other effigies. In both these instances, however, the likeness known or presumed to be the best should "weight" the most—i. e., should be allowed a longer exposure before the sensitized plate, and this is particularly the case when attempting, as Mr. Galton next proposes, "to compare the average features of the produce with those of the parentage." For example, "I should 'weight' each parent as 4, and each grandparent and each uncle as 1; again, I should weight each brother and sister as 4, and each of those cousins as 1 who inherited any part of the likeness of the family in question, etc." Finally, not only can men and women thus forecast the results of marriages, but breeders of animals may do the same for any proposed union. Mr. Galton solicits "sets of family photographs all as nearly as possible of the same size and taken in the same attitudes," and suggests as the proper size for them "that which gives one-half of an inch interval between the pupil of the eye and the line that separates the two lips." He shows how one may, by using the stereoscope, obtain the effect of two superimposed images; we can vouch for the striking results of this simple experiment.

—A correspondent writes to us from London, under date of May 18: "It is still something of an event in London when Mr. Henry Irving undertakes a new part; and I hope I shall not seem to speak brutally if I say that it is a good deal of an event when he undertakes it successfully. This happened several weeks ago, and the interval has proved the success. Mr. Irving appeared as *Louis XI.*, in an English 'arrangement,' of which I believe the perennial Mr. Boucicault has the credit, of Casimir Delavigne's rather dull and dreary drama of that name. It makes, as now performed at the Lyceum, quite what is called on the English stage (where alone the monstrosity is known) as a "one-part play." But Mr. Irving plays his one part very well, and it is probably his most satisfactory creation. In this elaborate, picturesque representation of a grotesque old tyrant, at once passionate and cunning, familiar and ferocious, he has the good fortune that some of his defects positively come to his assistance. He is an incongruous *Hamlet* or *Macbeth*, but he is a very consistent *Louis XI.* The part was a favorite one with Charles Kean, who played it with more delicacy, and, at the same time (according to my

recollection), with more *rondeur*, as the French say; but certainly, in the actual state of the English stage, there is no actor capable of doing the thing so cleverly and picturesquely as Mr. Henry Irving—in spite of his always saying 'gaw' for *go*, 'naw' for *no*, etc. Mr. Irving's eccentricities of utterance, however, are very numerous, and on this point the auditor must make a large concession at the outset. Apropos of the actual state of the English stage, I may add that it has just been very oddly illustrated by the remarkable success, at the Court Theatre, of Mr. Wills's play of 'Olivia,' a pathetic drama extracted—violently extracted—from the 'Vicar of Wakefield.' The idea of making an effective play, adapted to the modern appetite, of Goldsmith's delicate and humorous masterpiece, whose charm is almost wholly the exquisite narrative style, could have originated only with a playwright desperately at a loss for a subject. Yet 'Olivia,' with all Goldsmith's humor and delicacy left out, is a great success—a success rivalling that of the cleverly-played 'Diplomacy,' at the Prince of Wales's, of which a report was some time since given in your columns. It seemed to me at the Court Theatre that the success could only be accounted for by an extraordinary apathy of taste on the part of the public, and a good-natured disposition in the well-fed British playgoer who sits in the stalls after dinner to accept a pretty collection of eighteenth-century chairs, and buffets, and pottery, with which 'Olivia' is elaborately equipped, as a substitute for dramatic composition and finished acting. The play is tame, dull, and puerile, and the acting can hardly be condemned in a piece which offers such meagre opportunities. The only opportunities, in fact—and they are singularly few—are those of Miss Ellen Terry, as the heroine. Miss Ellen Terry, whom it is greatly the fashion to admire, has a great deal of charm and an interesting, pathetic, even beautiful countenance. But, whether it is the amateurship of the piece or not, the representative of the Vicar's erring daughter seems amateurish. The goody-goody, namby-pamby element in 'Olivia' is its most striking feature, and, combined with the extreme thinness of its interest, it really makes a thoughtful spectator revert longingly to those skilful productions of the French theatre in which, if the moral tone is loose, the dramatic texture is of the finest. It provokes him to declare that the highest morality, for a play, is that it be very well made. It would be interesting to hear the judgment of a first-rate French critic—of M. Francisque Sarcey, for example—upon such a drama and such a performance as 'Olivia.'"

HUGO'S HISTOIRE D'UN CRIME.*

WHY does Victor Hugo's last volume leave on the mind even of admirers a sense of unmistakable failure? The greatest of living French writers undertakes to denounce the vilest political crime of the nineteenth century. We expect one of those immortal diatribes by which indignant virtue has three or four times within the world's history branded successful vice with eternal infamy. Æschines will for all time writhe under the eloquence of Demosthenes. Catiline and Antony will never get rid of the insults hurled at them by Cicero. No historian, charm he never so wisely, will ever persuade mankind that Nero and Tiberius were not the monsters they are painted by Tacitus. The heroes of the Reign of Terror have found their followers, their admirers, and their apologists, but no skill of advocacy has availed to heal the wounds inflicted on their reputation by the combined insight, passion, and rhetoric of the 'Regicide Peace.' Victor Hugo might, we had hoped, have left as his last legacy to his country a picture of the *Coup d'état* which should throughout all generations cover Napoleonic Imperialism with infamy. If such was the aim of the greatest living genius who has ever devoted his talents to the service of republicanism, we are forced most unwillingly to admit that he has failed of his end, and to ask again what is the cause of the failure.

The causes—for there are more than one—are not far to seek, but they are worth consideration. The most obvious is that Victor Hugo's genius, great though it undoubtedly is, is not the genius of an orator of the first class. To attain perfection in the eloquence of invective, as in every other kind of eloquence, a writer or speaker needs (in addition to passion and imagination) self-restraint and rationality. Each of these qualities Victor Hugo, in spite of his transcendent powers, lacks. An orator must be passionate, but he must not write in a passion. Throughout every page of this volume the reader feels that Victor Hugo is angry, but the rage of the writer conceals the justice of his anger. No actor (and every orator or rhetorician is to a certain extent an actor) ever

* 'Histoire d'un Crime. Tome II. Par Victor Hugo.' Paris: Calmann Lévy; New York: F. W. Christern.

carried away his audience unless he himself was cool enough to act. How great is the effect of this perfect coolness may be seen by comparing Victor Hugo with an English author as much inferior to the Frenchman in genius as he is superior to Victor Hugo in the one gift of sending his rhetorical blows right home to their mark. This author is Junius. It is safe to conjecture that the masked assailant of George the Third and his ministers was a man of no great intellectual power, of narrow sympathies, and of limited imagination; but in the force which arises from coolness and self-restraint he ranks with the most powerful of satirists. We are no admirers of George the Third or his court, but George the Third was, we do not hesitate to assert, in comparison with Louis Napoleon, a high-toned patriot. The Duke of Grafton was not the ideal either of a man or of a minister, but even the vindictive hatred of Junius would draw a distinction between the ordinary vices of the duke and the astounding crimes of the scoundrels who planned and carried out the treacheries and atrocities of the *Coup d'état*. Yet Junius has made the men whom he denounces the objects of lasting contempt, and the secret of his success lies in the astonishing adroitness with which every blow is aimed exactly at the right point, and the equally astonishing art with which, in the midst of the most telling invective, Junius lets it appear that the crimes which he has revealed are as nothing to the unknown depth of turpitude which his indignation will, when fairly aroused, unveil for public execration. To Victor Hugo such reserve is totally unknown. He pours out an amount of abuse which under the circumstances is fully deserved by its object, but which makes it impossible to suppose that as far as Victor Hugo's knowledge goes we have not learnt the very worst which can be said of the President and his court.

The bad effect produced by a want of self-restraint is much increased by a marked want of rationality. The horrors of the *Coup d'état* hardly, it might well be thought, admit of exaggeration. Told simply and calmly by Tenot, and as they are, we must in fairness add, by Victor Hugo himself in some chapters of his last volume, they revive all the feelings of mingled hatred and contempt with which in 1852 every Liberal throughout the Old and New World regarded the President. But even the iniquities of the 2d of December provoke something like a smile when narrated in such epigrammatic bombast as this:

"Suddenly a window was opened.
"Upon Hell.
"Dante, had he leaned over the summit of the shadow, would have been able to see the eighth circle of his poem; the funereal Boulevard Montmartre.

"Paris, a prey to Bonaparte; a monstrous spectacle.
"The gloomy armed men massed together on this Boulevard felt an appalling spirit enter into them; they ceased to be themselves, and became demons.

"There was no longer a single French soldier, but a host of indefinite phantoms, carrying out a horrible task, as though in the glimmering light of a vision.

"There was no longer a flag, there was no longer law, there was no longer humanity, there was no longer a country, there was no longer France; they began to assassinate.

"The Schinderhannes division, the brigades of Mandrin, Cartouche, Poulailleur, Trestaillon, and Tropmann appeared in the gloom, shooting down and massacring.

"No; we do not attribute to the French army what took place during this mournful eclipse of honor.

"There have been massacres in history, abominable ones assuredly, but they have possessed some show of reason; Saint Bartholomew and the Dragonnades are explained by religion, the Sicilian Vespers and the butcheries of September are explained by patriotism; they crush the enemy or annihilate the foreigner; these are crimes for a good cause; but the carnage of the Boulevard Montmartre is a crime without an ostensible reason.

"The reason exists, however. It is hideous.

"Let us give it.

"Two things stand erect in a State, the Law and the People.

"A man murders the Law. He feels the punishment approaching, there only remains one thing for him to do, to murder the People. He murders the People.

"The Second of December was the Risk, the Fourth was the Certainty.

"Against the indignation which arose they opposed the Terror.

"The Fury, Justice, halted petrified before the Fury, Extermination. Against Erinyes they set up Medusa.

"To put Nemesis to flight, what a terrifying triumph!

"To Louis Napoleon pertains this glory, which is the summit of his shame.

"Let us narrate it.

"Let us narrate what History had never seen before.

"The assassination of a people by a man."

The quotation is a little long, though it is but a fragment of the rhetoric which fills the 'History of a Crime.' But it is well worth at-

tention. Of the exaggerations which it contains little need be said. We yield to no man in our hatred of the *Coup d'état* and its authors, but the simplest knowledge of history makes it impossible to admit that the world has never seen darker scenes than even the massacre of the second of December. What is better worth note is the strange irrationality which suggests that the slaughter of St. Bartholomew or the butcheries of September (perhaps the most cowardly series of crimes on record) admit of a kind of palliation because they arose from popular fanaticism or passion. Here we come to the very root of Victor Hugo's weakness. At bottom he adores passion. Hence insurgents or a mob have a certain half-sacredness in his eyes. At the worst, they have the inspiration of passion, even if they derive their inspiration from the devil. Hence again, and not from any meanness or want of courage, Victor Hugo, with all his daring and genius, cannot vigorously denounce the worst faults either of the people or of France. The *Coup d'état* was an infamous crime, but it never could have been crowned with success but for the apathy of Paris and the selfish cowardice of France. Yet throughout Victor Hugo's diatribe Paris must be treated as a sacred city, and the President and his co-conspirators must be made (deservedly enough, as far as they are concerned) a scapegoat which may carry off the guilt and responsibility that rests on the generation of Frenchmen who condoned the crimes of the President and admired the success of the Empire.

The same cause which weakens Victor Hugo's denunciation of popular errors accounts for the curious element of lawlessness apparent in his political views. He stood forth against the President as the righteous asserter of the law, yet you can hardly feel that he himself respected legality. He dramatically announced to his friends that come what would the President's head should not fall. To spare the life of the greatest of criminals was, he argued, to abolish capital punishment. The simple reflection that whether the President should, if vanquished, suffer death or not, depended solely on the fact whether he had committed a crime which the law punished with death, never seems to have occurred to a leader the strength of whose position lay in obedience to law. To support the law and to override it is conduct quite in keeping with the character of a man who most righteously excited the artisans to take up arms in defence of the Republic, and at the same time most absurdly refused (though risking his life) himself to fire a shot.

The want of reasonableness which runs through Victor Hugo's character has marred even the literary effectiveness of his last volume. But a second cause of that work's comparative failure is, that Victor Hugo has undertaken a task difficult in itself and singularly ill-suited to his genius. The Republican historian of the plot which destroyed the Republic must be not only the assailant of the President but also the apologist of the Republicans. A calm and candid writer would admit that the Republican leaders were, from the fall of Louis Philippe to the second of December, 1851, in a false position, and that no one of them showed anything like the statesmanship which might possibly, in 1848, have achieved the great feat, which has been achieved in 1878, of bringing over the nation to the support of the Republic. But of the calm apology which admits the faults, and errors even, of men who ultimately defended the cause of freedom and legality against lawless despotism, Victor Hugo knows nothing. The Republic is in his eyes a government by divine right. The Republican leaders are faultless heroes and immaculate martyrs. He hardly sees, and therefore cannot properly apologize for, the errors of his party. Yet, that the very success of 1848 placed the Republicans in a false position must now be patent to every impartial observer. To put the Revolution of February on the same level as the plot of December is to confound a grave error with an atrocious crime. Nevertheless, it is impossible to deny that the party who overthrew a legal government by means of the Paris mob did not stand on strong ground when four years later they attempted in vain to protect the legal government against the army of Paris. Add to this that in their dealings with the President the sincere Republicans exhibited the utmost political incapacity. Suspecting treachery, they took no single effective step for their own protection, and, though they must have foreseen that an armed attack was highly probable, never arranged any course of proceeding in case the attack should take place. But to these and the other errors committed by himself and his friends Victor Hugo is blind. Hence his narrative of the contest in which he and his associates were overpowered by force has a false ring, and the tragedy reads far too much like a melodrama. You see striking scenes, you have pictures of heroic exertion and of heroic self-sacrifice, but no part of the drama is clearly connected with the other, and you find it difficult to understand how it

happened that men inspired with genius, resolution, and self-devotion received no support from the people.

It must also be added that a narrative which does not make prominent the errors and faults committed by the Republicans in 1851 inevitably fails to suggest the lesson which those errors ought to convey. The true moral of the 'History of a Crime' is that a set of reckless desperadoes overthrew the Republic of 1848 because the nation had not been gained over to the side of the Republic. In 1878 the Republicans have shown that they are strong enough to resist a president at least as powerful and possibly not much more scrupulous than Louis Napoleon. But in 1878 the Republic has become the government not of a party but of the nation. If the historian of a crime could have told calmly the story of the *Coup d'état* he might both have covered the criminal with infamy and have shown the strength of the Republic of 1878. Victor Hugo, however, who is still at heart the Republican of 1848, if he has revived the memory of Louis Napoleon's crimes, has also recalled to the recollection of the world the follies of the Republicans which made possible the triumph of the President. One object of the work has been missed, and the book will remain for ever a monument of the failure to which even genius is exposed when attempting tasks unsuited for its powers.

Charlotte Cushman. Her Letters and Memories of Her Life. Edited by her friend, Emma Stebbins. (Boston: Houghton, Osgood & Co. 1878. 8vo, pp. 308.)—It is fit that the memoirs of Charlotte Cushman should thus early appear, succeeding at no great interval the biographies of William Charles Macready and Edwin Forrest, the two great actors from whom she learned much, and with whom for more than a quarter of a century she shared the sovereignty of the stage. Miss Stebbins's book is a better biography than Mr. Alger's ponderous 'Life of Forrest.' It brings before us distinctly the keen intelligence, the loving disposition, the faculty of making and keeping friends, the unchanging cheerfulness, the self-reliance, the clear common-sense, and, above all, the stalwart strength of will which made Charlotte Cushman what she was—in spite of trouble and trial, in spite of loss of voice just when success as a singer seemed within her reach, in spite of want of money when she was working her way along as an actress, in spite of insidious disease when at last she had gained fame and fortune. Miss Stebbins devotes most of her first chapter ("Genealogical Sketch of the Cushman Family") to a showing of the actress's descent from Robert Cushman, one of the two financiers and managers of the adventurers who set out for these shores two hundred and fifty years ago in the *Mayflower* and the *Speedwell*, and all through the book there is ample evidence that Charlotte Cushman had inherited the sturdy soul of her ancestor, and that she had her full share of Yankee grit. It is in this presentation of the character of her subject that the author has been most successful, and in her description of the life in Rome during those years when Charlotte Cushman's apartments were the centre of a choice circle—and in but little else. The interest of the reader in Charlotte Cushman arises from her having been a great actress. From this biography there is much to be learned about her as a woman. There is nothing—indeed, less than nothing—to be learned about her as an actress.

Miss Stebbins's memoir is, in fact, the least theatrical of all theatrical biographies. We rise from the reading of Davies's Life of Garrick or the 'Reminiscences' of Macready with a distinct and heightened impression of the merit of each as an actor. From this book we get what we know to be a false view of Charlotte Cushman's ability as an actress. Not that Miss Stebbins does not praise her acting; the praise is not discriminating, it is even ignorant. The author has plainly but little knowledge of the stage either internally or externally. Her book is full of blunders in theatrical history and in dramatic criticism. Here, for instance, is one of Miss Stebbins's assertions (p. 24): "Beyond the due expression and feeling given to the words, which she could never wholly omit even in study or rehearsal, the acting was left to the inspiration of the time and place." If this were so, Miss Cushman's career would hardly have called for a biography, for she would never have risen above mediocrity. No one who knew anything of the principles of the art of acting ever saw her act *Queen Katharine* without being sure that the whole conception of the part had been thoroughly thought out, and its mechanism wholly mastered. The stage is the last place where happy-go-lucky "inspiration" is likely to succeed, and this was certainly known to the writer of the letter (p. 142) which thanks a friend for speaking "approvingly of my beloved art, and all that it takes to make an exponent of it. . . . But no one

knows better than myself, after all my association with artists of sculpture or painting, how truly *my* art comprehends all others and surpasses them, in so far as the study of mind is more than matter."

This very letter from which we have just quoted cites a speech of *Tisbe's* (a character in Victor Hugo's "Angelo"), which Charlotte Cushman frequently played; but no mention of the fact is made here, nor of her appearance in the spectacular play of the "Naiad Queen," in which she led an Amazonian march, marshalling her fair warriors with great success. Doubtless there are other parts in which she was successful, or which she at least attempted, not recorded by Miss Stebbins. It is impossible, for instance, to ascertain from her volume the date of the famous first performance in New York of that meretricious bauble, "London Assurance," in which Charlotte Cushman played *Lady Gay Spanker*. Dates are all too sparingly inserted; a few more of these and a full list of all parts played are greatly to be desired. Such a list would have shown Miss Stebbins that so far from Charlotte Cushman and Edwin Forrest never having played together, she supported him for two seasons at the Park Theatre, and not entirely, it is said, to his satisfaction—which was perhaps the reason why, when he brought out the "Lady of Lyons" for the first time in this city, she was cast for the comparatively insignificant *Widow Melnotte*, which she, however, succeeded in raising into prominence. It would also show us how many absolutely new parts she undertook—"created," in the French phrase. We are told here that Talfourd promised to write a play for her, and the unfortunate fate of Chorley's "Duchess Eleanor" is here set down. Charles Lamb declared that John Kemble thought all the good plays had been written, and it seems as though Charlotte Cushman agreed with him. Certainly we owe fewer additions to dramatic literature to her than to any other actor of her prominence of late years; Macready and Forrest, and even Charles Kean, have left behind them plays of which they were the exciting cause. Charlotte Cushman has left none, unless we take account of the galvanizing again into a spasmodic existence of the wretched version of 'Guy Mannering' in which she was *Meg Merrilies*. Miss Stebbins gives 1841 as the date of her first performance of this part, which is at least four years too late. The story of Braham's having been greatly astonished and delighted by her acting it seems rather apocryphal, inasmuch as she had made a success in it years before he first visited America. These things show again that Miss Stebbins has done little or nothing for the student of the stage; she knew and admired Charlotte Cushman off the stage, and it is only off the stage that she can appreciate her and makes us appreciate her.

The book is beautifully printed, and has a sufficient index. It is adorned with three permanent photographs—one of Miss Cushman's villa at Newport, another from the author's portrait-bust of her, and the frontispiece—a firm and striking photograph of late date by Gutekunst.

Dictionary of English Literature. Being a Comprehensive Guide to English Authors and their Works. By W. Davenport Adams. (London and New York: Cassell, Petter & Galpin. 1878. Small 4to, pp. iv.-708.)—The aim of this work is to present in alphabetical order the most prominent English writers, their leading works, the various pseudonyms adopted by writers, the leading characters in poetry, drama, and fiction, and a large number of familiar quotations. Biography is mainly confined to dates; but little first-hand criticism is attempted, the opinions of others being quoted freely. There are special articles on the drama, newspapers, novels, which compose the most original part of the work. The articles on the English Drama and the dramatic notices are particularly full and generally well done. The author is evidently more familiar with the later English literature than with that of an earlier period, and sympathizes with the sensuous school of which Swinburne is the most conspicuous example. Tennyson and Swinburne occupy more space than Milton and Dryden; Pope and Swift together five times as much as Chaucer; Walt Whitman as much as Mrs. Browning or her husband. In some respects the plan is faulty, and in many respects its execution is defective. Especially not worth while was it to cumber the pages of a Dictionary of English Literature with familiar quotations, many of them repeated three or four times by cross references, for but a small portion can be admitted, and there is at least one Dictionary of Familiar Quotations which makes competition hopeless. Moreover, the attempt to introduce them alphabetically gives rise to the most ludicrous inversions—e.g., "Fall was there! O what a"; "Human face divine, Or"; "Ripe and Ripe, We"; "Difference to me, Oh, the."

A want of fulness and general accuracy is observable throughout the work: we have made the following memoranda in a cursory examina-

tion. As regards American literature, no place has been found for Henry N. Hudson, George P. Marsh, Lewis H. Morgan, or Henry C. Lea (to mention no others), of living scholars and writers. Dickens's 'American Notes' are stated to have given great offence in America, but no reference whatever is made to the courteous note of apology which Dickens wrote after his last visit, and which he ordered printed in every subsequent edition. The London *Athenæum* is admitted, but not the *Academy*. Dodsley's 'Old Plays' is cited with no mention of the edition except in the last half of the book, where Carew Hazlitt's is referred to. The various editions of this standard collection vary so much that the mere description of "Dodsley" is wholly insufficient. Hazlitt's edition contains Dodsley's original ten volumes, his two supplemental volumes, Dilke's 'Old Plays,' Hawkins's 'English Drama,' and the plays given in Collier's 'History of the English Drama.' The lines "Apollo from his shrine Can no more divine" are referred to Milton's "Il Penseroso," when every school-boy knows that they are from the "Ode on the Nativity." Thos. Heywood's 'Apology for Actors' is called a *poem*! It is prose, and prosy enough, too, not to be mistaken for poetry. The Shakespeare Society's edition, to which reference is made, is preceded by certain commendatory poems, which the writer evidently mistook for the body of the work. The Anglo-Saxon poem of Beowulf "was edited by T. Arnold in 1876." This is a half truth that carries a falsehood, no allusion being made to the fact that there are several older and better editions. Thorkelin, a Dane, issued the first edition in 1815, and since that date editions have appeared in England by Thorpe and by Kemble; in Germany by Ettmüller (in part), Grein, Heyne, and several translations. Arnold's is the latest, but unquestionably not the best edition. Heyne's is probably the best; it contains the text, with notes and a glossary; it has recently passed to a second edition. Mr. Adams refers the 'Court of Love' to Chaucer, without any hint of the fact that the best critics do not consider it his. The Coventry Plays are referred to as being in MS., yet they were published by the Shakespeare Society in 1841. "From Dan to Beer-sheba" is said to be "an expression used by Sterne in his 'Sentimental Journey'!" Did the author never meet this expression in a book much older than the 'Sentimental Journey'? "Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain," by the Venerable Bede, translated by King Alfred, and first published about 1473." This is too gross an error to be due to mere ignorance; it is probably a misprint. Printing was not introduced into England until 1474, according to the generally received accounts. The first edition of Alfred's translation of Bede was that of Whelock in 1643; the next was that of Smith in 1722. The "Octavia" is a play said to be "adapted from the *Greek of Seneca*," and the same statement is repeated as to the "Thebais" and the "Thyestes." The writer's library must be unique if it contains a copy of Seneca in Greek.

There are numerous misprints, not a few of which are attributable to sheer carelessness. Dr. Johnson's sarcasm on Bolingbroke is turned into a bull of the first water: "Having discharged a blunderbuss against morality and religion, he had not the courage to fire it off himself, but left half a crown to a beggarly Scotchman to draw the trigger after his death." The quotation, moreover, is silently mutilated, though the omitted words contain the gist of the charge. Moore's song is given as "Come, rest in this bosom, my young stricken deer." For "young" read "own." The motto of the *Edinburgh Review* is given as "Tenui musam meditatur avara." Charles Fenno Hoffman appears as Charles Fenn Hoffman. Bell's edition of the poets is quoted as "Bell's *Annotated Edition*." The old English song, "Somer is ycomen in," is shockingly misprinted, while Spenser's lines on Chaucer are thus made ridiculous:

"Dan Chaucer, well of English undefyled,
On Fame's eternal bead-roll worthie to be pyled."

For "pyled" read "fyled." Finally, foreign authors whose works have been translated into English are very arbitrarily inserted. Thus, one looks in vain for Mérimée, Manzoni, Fritz Reuter, Turgeneff, Tegnér, etc.

Synoptical Flora of North America. Vol. II., Part 1. *Gamopetalæ after Compositæ.* By Asa Gray, LL.D., etc. (New York: Ivison, Blakeman, Taylor & Co. 1878. Pp. 402, imp. 8vo.)—At length we have a first instalment of the long-looked-for continuation of Torrey and Gray's 'Flora of North America.' Forty years ago these two botanists, *par nobis fratrum*, began what was intended to be an approximately complete Flora of America, "north of Mexico." Five years and more were spent, Europe was visited to study the original specimens upon which very many American species were founded, all the active botanists of every section of the country were united in procuring new material, and two

volumes of over 1,200 pages were issued between the years 1828 and 1843, carrying the work through the *Compositæ*, and leaving still a half to be done. Glancing at the list of coadjutors in that work, as given in the preface to the first volume, we can but note how they belonged to a generation that has now passed away—Nuttall, Oakes, Hitchcock, Dewey, Sartwell, Beck, Bailey, Eaton, Darlington, Durand, Schweinitz, Curtis, Elliott, Le Conte, Leavenworth, Riddell, Short, Peter, Rafinesque, Sullivant, Lapham; only here and there is the name of one who may still be seen among the living. Bigelow, Tuckerman, Barratt, Chapman, Buckley, these alone remain of the eighty or more to whom acknowledgment is made for aid received. So too of the foreign botanists mentioned—Brown, Hooker, Lindley, Arnott, Don, Lambert, Boott, Fraser, Jus-sieu, De Candolle, Endlicher, Fenzl, Martius, Zuccarini, Schlechtendahl, Kunth, Trinius, Bongard, Lehmann—all have joined the majority, save alone Bentham and Decaisne. Of the two at the head of the former work one has gone to his rest, honored and beloved, while the other, still in the full vigor of his intellect, unwearied and unworn by his many years of busy and fruitful toil, holds firm to his early purpose, and has given us to-day the earnest of a completed task.

The conviction that the time had not come for such an undertaking interrupted the early attempt, and the progress of events has justified that conviction. Our borders were soon afterwards extended to include Texas, Utah, and all the region westward to the Pacific. This political enlargement was followed by a gradual development of our knowledge of the flora of this vast region through the collections made by Lindheimer and Wright in Texas, by Fendler in New Mexico, and afterwards by the botanists connected with the surveys for a railroad route to the Pacific and for the location of the Mexican boundary. Later still, the State Survey of California, under Prof. J. D. Whitney, has gone far towards completing the botany of the Pacific Coast. Clarence King's survey of the 40th parallel has done the same for Nevada and Utah, while private collectors and the Government surveys under Prof. Hayden, Lieutenant Wheeler, and others, have made familiar the flora of the Rocky Mountains and, though to a less degree, that of New Mexico and Arizona. Through these means many hundreds of species have been added to those before known, and the increase still goes on at the rate of nearly a hundred each year. But at a still more rapid rate has grown the need of a systematic descriptive work that should include all that are already known. What was a want forty years ago has now become a necessity, for what was then simply confusion is now a comparative chaos.

Upon Dr. Gray the hopes of all botanists, at home and abroad, have been centred for the performance of the task, and as an acknowledgment that the fulness of time has come when such a work may rightly be expected and asked for, we have the present volume. And it is such a volume as would be looked for from the author's hands; in its typography, its arrangement, its style, as a whole and in its minutiae, showing the care and scientific skill of a master. It does not become the raw recruit to criticise the veteran soldier, but he may call upon his comrades to note and imitate the dextrous handling of his weapons, the perfectly executed manœuvre, the entire subordination to rule. So the botanist, or any scientific man in fact, while he may not hope for that keenness of insight, that power of delicately balancing conditions and quick judgment which characterize the man, may wisely study the principles and methods which he follows in a matured work like this.

The part now published completes the gamopetalous division of the dicotyledons, beginning where the original work ceased. The remainder of the volume, in two similar parts, will include the other phanogamous orders and the higher cryptogamia. The first volume will be given to a complete revision of the ground gone over in the earlier volumes, which are not only now out of print but have long been out of date. Thus well begun, a few years will doubtless see the whole completed—complete in itself, but still only the first division of a still greater work that shall include the whole of the essentially one and continuous flora occupying the northern temperate and arctic zones. For the parts relating to Europe and Northern Asia, American botanists are in no way responsible; but it will be to the credit of American science that in its own finished portion it will furnish a model from a master's hand, worthy of imitation.

*. Publishers will confer a favor by always marking the price of their books on the wrapper.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Authors.—Titles.	Publishers.—Prices.
Alden (W. L.), <i>Shooting-Stars</i>	(G. P. Putnam's Sons) \$1 00
David (S. F.), <i>Annual Record of Science and Industry for 1877</i>	(Harper & Bros.)
Brennan (Rev. J. J.), <i>Catechism of the History of Ireland</i>	(Thomas Kelly)
Burritt (E.), <i>Chips from Many Blocks</i>	(Rose-Belford Pub. Co.)
Butler-Johnstone (H. A. M.), <i>Trip up the Volga</i>	(Porter & Coates) 1 25

3,
ne
ne
n-
y,
s,
li-
ny
n,
g-
ed
as-
al,
ve
rk
in
ars
en

ng
ed
de
cal
of
er
ho
ific
ur-
m-
the
col-
ant
un-
ma.
ose
y a
l of
ady
ity,

ave
dg-
ntly
h a
po-
ing
re-
udes
ctly
aist,
s of
dg-
and

the
nder
uous
to a
hich
well
e in
l in-
the
rope
ut it
tion

the

rices.
\$1 00